

AF/GP 2711

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: S. Chakrabarty et al.

Serial No.: 08/947,221

Filed: July 8, 1998

For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR FILTERING
OF INFORMATION ENTITIES

) Art Unit: 2711

) Examiner: U. Le

) CASE NO.: AM9-97-120

) December 30, 1999
750 B Street, Suite 3120
San Diego, CA 92101



TRANSMITTAL LETTER FOR - AFTER FINAL REMARKS

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

RECEIVED
JAN - 4 2000
TECH CENTER 2700

Dear Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action dated September 30, 1999, enclosed herewith are the following:

- (1) A Transmittal Letter for - After Final Remarks in 1 pg. w/Cert. of Express Mailing;
- (2) After Final Remarks in 4 pages;
- (3) An acknowledgment postcard.

Respectfully submitted,

John L. Rogitz, Atty. of Record, Reg. No. 33,549
750 "B" Street, Suite 3120, San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 338-8075

JLR:jg
Encs.

CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING

I hereby certify that this document, together with any papers described as attached or enclosed, is being deposited with the United States Postal Service, "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service, Express Mailing label No. EL388927373 US under 37 CFR §1.10, addressed to Box AF, Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on

12/30, 1999.

Date Signed: 12/30, 1999

JOHN L. ROGITZ, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 33,549

MAIL DATE CANCELLED

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE
JCS74

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



Applicant: Chakrabarti et al.) Art Unit: 2711
Serial No.: 08/947,221) Examiner: Le
Filed: July 8, 1998) AM9-97-120
For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR FILTERING OF) December 30, 1999
INFORMATION ENTITIES) 750 B STREET, Suite 3120
) San Diego, CA 92101
)
RECEIVED
TELEFAX CENTER 2700
M - 4 2000

AFTER FINAL REMARKS

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

Dear Sir:

The following remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action dated September 30, 1999. The Examiner is cordially invited to review the remarks and telephone the undersigned to resolve the outstanding issues if possible, prior to appeal.

Claim 1 has been rejected as being obvious in light of Deerwester, which relates non-hyperlinked documents together and which nowhere appears to mention hyperlinks, in light of Barrett et al., used simply as a teaching that hyperlinked documents exist. In contrast, independent Claim 12 has been rejected as being anticipated by Deerwester, on the ground that Deerwester does not explicitly require its affinity values to be symmetric (although they appear to be) in contrast to the express limitation of Claim 12. Likewise, independent Claim 13 has been rejected as being anticipated by Deerwester, on the ground that Deerwester